REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 12, 2008. Claims 1-18 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 17 are in independent form. Claims 1-17 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added by way of these clarifying amendments. For example, see ¶4 - ¶5. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for all payments due in connection with this Response.

The Office action rejected independent claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0186653 to Jensen ("Jensen"). In light of the clarifying claim amendments made herein, Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and traverses these rejections.

More specifically, each independent claim now recites, inter alia, "a Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol (VRRP) obtained from an Internet Protocol Version 4 provided by an Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and an Internet Protocol Version 6 provided by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)." In other words, each independent claim now recites a specific Virtual Router Redundancy Protocol (VRRP) instead of a generic virtual router redundancy protocol.

Both the present invention and Jensen are directed to improving network redundancy. and both include master and slave routers. However, according to the present invention, the master router is the acting router, while according to Jensen the standby router is the acting router.

Moreover, according to the present invention a similar problem is solved in a completely different way. In detail, according to the present invention the existing VRRP mechanism is modified or extended by a specific add-on. Thus, the present invention is still based on VRRP. The add-on improves the drawback of the current VRRP, which is well defined in the introductory part of the present specification. VRRP is in general described and standardized by RFC 2338.

In contrast, Jensen teaches that the existing VRRP mechanism is replaced by a completely new mechanism. According to Jensen (e.g., ¶10), "One embodiment of the invention may provide redundancy in a network without the disadvantages associated with

conventional systems, such as VRRP system." Moreover, Jensen unambiguously states that his solution shall substitute the current or conventional system, i.e. the VRRP system.

In contrast, the present application clearly states that the present invention adheres to the well known VRRP mechanism, which shall be modified or extended. For example ¶15 of the present application states, "The solution of the problem is achieved by providing criteria, or policies, defined for the connection between the Access Area and IP-Back bone that trigger the switching process in the sub-network. The policy-function influences the VRRP-Process and can therewith guarantee the redundancy from the Access Area to the IPBackbone. With this technical leap forward, the assignable criteria (policies) trigger the VRRP-Process. Through which, a redundant IP-connection over the Ethernet from the Access Area to the IP-backbone (core router) is guaranteed." Thus, the present invention provides a further trigger within the standardized VRRP-process but does not remove the VRRP process by a different process.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 17, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Jensen and in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY _____

James F. Goedken
Reg. No. 44,715
Customer No. 24573

Dated: September 12, 2008